# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JOHN G. WALKER,	) 3:13-cv-00485-RCJ-WGC	
Plaintiff, vs.	) MINUTES OF THE COURT	
vs.	) October 16, 2014	
MICHAEL HALEY, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	) ) )	
PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING		
COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING		
COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING		

#### MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is plaintiff's motion to compel (Doc. #38), wherein Plaintiff seeks to compel Defendants to answer interrogatories Plaintiff has served in this matter. Plaintiff also seeks an extension of time to effect service on certain defendants. (Id.) Defendants have responded, explaining the delay behind providing Plaintiff the Defendants' answers to his interrogatories and confirming the answers have been provided Plaintiff. (Doc. #42.) Defendants did not address the service issue. No reply memorandum has been filed.

### I. Discovery Issue

Because it appears Defendants have responded to the discovery served by Plaintiff, the Motion to Compel (Doc. # 38) is **DENIED AS MOOT.** 

The court advises Plaintiff, however, that his motion could have been summarily denied at the outset by reason of his failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1) and Local Rule 27-7(b). As is stated in the Local Rule, "[d]iscovery motions will not be considered unless a statement of the movant is attached thereto certifying that, after personal consultation and sincere effort to do so, the parties have been unable to resolve the matter without Court action." Plaintiff's motion contains no such verification. Defendants' memorandum states that had Plaintiff contacted Defendants' counsel, he could have confirmed that the discovery responses would soon be served - and apparently were in fact provided Plaintiff. Additionally, the Local Rules require submission of the disputed discovery documents (L.R. 26-7(a)) and Plaintiff's motion did not contain the text of the disputed discovery. Plaintiff is advised the court will not entertain any further discovery motions from Plaintiff unless he demonstrates compliance with the local rules.

# MINUTES OF THE COURT

3:13-cv-00485-RCJ-WGC Date: October 16, 2014

Page 2

# II. Extension of Time

Plaintiff seeks an extension of time to effect service on the un-served defendants. He does not identify which defendants are unserved but it appears to be Ross Taylor and David Evans. Summons have been issued for each defendant and delivered to the U. S. Marshal for service (Doc. ## 41 & 45). (It appears that named Defendants Youngblood and Leonard have also possibly not been served.)

The components of Plaintiff's motions (Docs. # 38 and # 43) seeking an extension of time to effect service on these Defendants are **GRANTED**. Plaintiff shall have until December 1, 2014, to complete service on all unserved defendants.

Plaintiff is further cautioned that in the future, motions involving unrelated issues (such as Plaintiff's Motion to Compel/Motion for Extension) should be submitted as separate motions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By:	/s/	
Deputy Clerk		